

6

Docket No. LIP-101XC1
Serial No. 10/776,830Remarks

Claims 1-16 were pending in the subject application. By this amendment, the applicant has amended claims 1, 6, 14 and 15 and has cancelled claim 3. Accordingly, claims 1, 2 and 4-16 are before the Examiner for consideration. Favorable consideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

The amendments to the claims have been made in an effort to lend greater clarity to the claimed subject matter and to expedite prosecution. These amendments should not be taken to indicate the applicant's agreement with, or acquiescence to, the rejections of record. Favorable consideration of the claims now presented, in view of the remarks and amendments set forth herein, is earnestly solicited.

The applicant wishes to thank Examiner Frech for the courtesy extended to her and the undersigned during the personal Examiner Interview conducted on August 22, 2005. This response and the amendments set forth herein are submitted in accordance with the substance of that interview and constitute a summary thereof.

Specifically, in order to expedite prosecution, the applicant has focused the claims on her unique system and, in particular, the order of steps used. As discussed in the Examiner Interview and as summarized below, the claims as amended address the rejections of record.

First, claim 15 had been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The applicant appreciates the Examiner's identification of aspects of the claim that created ambiguity in the claimed subject matter. The claims have now been amended herein to lend greater clarity to the claimed subject matter and to address the issues raised by the Examiner. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C §102(b) as being anticipated by well-known prior art. Also, claims 6-7, 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over well known prior art. Finally, claim 13 has also been rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over well-known prior art in vie of Lee 5,704,653. The

J:\STI-RESPM\IP\101XC1\PTO\amend.doc\DNB\la

7

Docket No. LIP-101XC1
Serial No. 10/776,830

applicant respectfully traverses these grounds for rejection because the applicant's system, with its particular order in which the steps are performed, is not the same as, or suggested by, previous procedures for naming constellations.

Please note that the applicant has amended her claims herein to more clearly define the unique order in which she goes about naming a constellation. This system provides a unique and advantageous system for honoring people, events, etc in a particular meaningful way. This system is distinct from, and not suggested by, previous well-known methods for naming constellations. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103.

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments to the claims, the applicants believe that the currently pending claims are in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees under 37 CFR §§1.16 or 1.17 as required by this paper to Deposit Account No. 19-0065.

The applicants invite the Examiner to call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any of this response, or if the Examiner believes a telephonic interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,



David R. Saliwanchik
Patent Attorney
Registration No. 31,794
Registration No. 45,332
Phone No.: 352-375-8100
Fax No.: 352-372-5800
Address: P.O. Box 142950
Gainesville, FL 32614-2950

DRS/la

J:\SHI-RESP\LIP\LIP-101XC\PTO\amend.doc\DNB/la